DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 115 UD 032 760

TITLE	Secret Apartheid III: Follow Up to Failure.
INSTITUTION	New York Chapter of Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, New York.
SPONS AGENCY	Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, Inc., New York, NY.
PUB DATE	1998-06-15
NOTE	65p.; For related documents, see ED 418 178 and ED 418 179.
AVAILABLE FROM	New York ACORN, 88 Third Avenue, 3rd Floor, Brooklyn, NY 11217; Tel: 718-246-7900; Fax: 718-246-7929.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Academically Gifted; Black Students; *Equal Education; Hispanic Americans; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Middle Schools; *Minority Groups; Program Implementation; Public Schools; Student Placement; *Urban Schools; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	Middle School Students; *New York City Board of Education; *Underrepresentation

ABSTRACT

The New York Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) studies of public schools continue with this report on course work for gifted students and public middle school students in general. Fourteen ACORN volunteers made 52 visits to 28 schools studied in 1996. Findings from these visits and the review of school system documents show that black and Latino children are underrepresented in gifted programs throughout the New York City school system. Latino students are underrepresented in more than two-thirds of the programs and they are only overrepresented in a handful of schools. White students are twice as likely to be overrepresented in a program as African American students and more than eight times more likely to be overrepresented than Latino students. Five of the 10 schools receiving federal magnet funding have at least half of their white enrollment concentrated in their magnet programs. Twenty percent of the middle schools in the school districts studied did not offer Sequential Mathematics 1 and 52% did not offer the New York Regents Earth Science class. In the schools that did offer sequential math to eighth graders, the course was only available to one class of students. In many cases study volunteers had difficulty getting information from the schools, or even gaining access to principals and teachers. There is evidence that both accountability and standards have been abandoned in the treatment of students of color in the New York City Schools. The school district's survey about programs for gifted students is attached. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 115

Secret Apartheid III

Follow Up to Failure

by the

New York ACORN Schools Office

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mariana Davenport
ACORN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Copyright June 15, 1998

UD032760

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The New York ACORN Schools Office wishes to express its thanks to the many individuals and organizations who made this study possible. Fourteen volunteers made 52 visits to 28 schools.

Patrice Latarola and Jodi Paroff of the Institute for Education and Social Policy at New York University compiled and analyzed Board of Education data which support our findings, particularly around the question of the availability of challenging course work.

We want to thank Katie Haycock, Amy Wilkens, Ruth Mitchell, and Patricia Martin of the Washington-based Education Trust for their help in thinking through our original approach to evaluating the relationship between curriculum and the test for the science high schools. At an early point in the *Secret Apartheid* project, Bob Schaefer of Fair Test served as sounding board for our plans for this investigation and aided us in identifying practitioners who could further our understanding of deconstructing tests. John Cawthorne of Boston College streamlined our tasks by suggesting that we document the course work taken by students who eventually attend the specialized highs schools and by those who do not.

Scott Gelber from Columbia University provided indispensable assistance in the preliminary analysis of the Chancellor's survey of gifted programs and other aspects of our data crunching.

John M. Beam of Pumphouse Projects performed much of the quantitative analysis as well as writing and editing for this report.

The Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, Inc. provided funding in support of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . . Page 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . . Page 3

INTRODUCTION . . . . . Page 6

METHODOLOGY . . . . . Page 9

FINDINGS . . . . . Page 13

CONCLUSIONS . . . . . Page 26

RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . Page 27

APPENDIX . . . . . Page 30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Secret Apartheid III: Follow Up to Failure presents evidence that both accountability and standards -- of pedagogy and decency -- have been abandoned in the treatment of students of color in the New York City Public Schools.

Three strands of investigation come together in this report:

- An examination of the *Survey For Programs Serving Gifted Students, Spring 1996* ordered by the Chancellor in response to grass roots pressure from ACORN and an appraisal of the relationship between gifted programs and federal and state magnet funding.

- An investigation of the Board of Education's compliance with the consent agreement between the Board of Education and the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, another result of ACORN's advocacy for better schools.

- Research on the 1996-97 distribution of rigorous course work at the middle school level in a cross section of New York City community school districts.

Key findings from this study include:

- Children of color are dramatically underrepresented in gifted programs throughout the system.

Latino children are underrepresented in more than two thirds of the programs described by the surveys and occasionally over represented in a mere handful. White students are twice as likely to be over represented in a program as African American students and are over represented eight times more frequently than Latino students.

- In at least 14 gifted programs, between 50 and 100 percent of the school's white enrollment is concentrated in the gifted program.

- Among these schools are some of the City's top recipients of magnet school funding.

Five of the ten schools receiving federal magnet funding have at least half of their white enrollment concentrated in their magnet programs. A sixth has almost half (49 percent). These schools share over $600,000 in federal magnet money. Two other schools

which place 97 and 89 percent of their white students in gifted programs receive more than a third of a million dollars in state magnet funding.

- In 32 visits to schools, African American and Latina testers succeeded in speaking with an educator (principal, teacher, etc.) only four times (12.5 percent). Only one of the four was a principal.

- In five visits, black or Hispanic testers were prevented from getting information from various school offices by security guards who refused them entry to the school; a white tester also encountered this problem.

The overarching finding of this section of our study is that the Board of Education has not made even a good faith effort to live up to the commitments made to the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. Compared to ACORN's 1996 investigation of schools which prompted the OCR agreement, 1998 visits by testers who were people of color resulted in a slightly lower rate of classroom tours, a higher rate of security guard interference with parent inquiries, and a substantially lower success rate in actually speaking with educators about the schools. White testers fared about the same both years.

- In the 1996-1997 school year, 20 percent (17 of 86) of the middle schools in the selected districts failed to offer Sequential I Math and 52 percent (45 of 86) fail to offer Regents Earth Science.

- In schools that *do* offer Sequential I Math to eighth graders, in 52 percent of those schools (36 of 69) the course is only available to one class of students on the grade level.

With the exception of one district -- Community School District 17 -- in the districts selected as the most and least successful at sending students to the science high schools there was no significant change in the distribution of rigorous curriculum in the city's middle schools between our first look at this issue last year and this spring.

Based on these and other findings described in the body of this report, we strongly advocate for the following policy and programmatic changes in the New York City Public Schools:

- To address the difficulty black and Latino parents have in obtaining information about schools their children might attend, the Board of Education should contract with a community based organization to operate a "Choice Clearinghouse" where information

about all New York City schools and programs will be centralized and available in a user-friendly format to interested parents.

- Tracking in the New York City Public Schools must be phased out, beginning immediately with tracking in k-3.

- Course work that prepares middle school students to do well in an academically superior high school and to be able to compete on the Examination for the Special High Schools should be established as the norm in all middle schools beginning next fall.

- Concrete steps must be taken immediately in the outreach and selection process for all public school gifted programs to ensure that their racial composition reflects the school and community in which the programs are located.

- We call on the Auditor General of the U.S. Department of Education and the New York State Comptroller to investigate the expenditure of federal and state magnet monies in the New York City Public Schools.

INTRODUCTION

New York ACORN was founded in 1980 and rapidly became one of the strongest affiliates of the nationally known grass roots organization. There are ACORN neighborhood groups and tenant organizations in the four largest boroughs of New York. ACORN groups across the city have been active around issues of neighborhood crime and pollution, the abuse of so-called job creation and retention incentives by huge corporations, and the creation of affordable housing for very low income New Yorkers. ACORN's 22,000 member families, who pay modest annual dues to help support their organization, are primarily African American, Afro-Caribbean, Puerto Rican, and Dominican. A majority of the executive board consists of low income women of color, most of whom are parents.

The ACORN Schools Office was established in 1988 to respond to the intense interest in improving local schools expressed by residents of neighborhoods, public housing projects, and apartment blocks who make up the membership. The Schools Office channels ACORN's nationally recognized expertise in community organizing and provides technical information, education related leadership development, and other resources to the school reform struggles of very low income and working poor families in New York City. The Schools Office has built a steadily expanding base of parents who have the information, skills, and perspective necessary to recreate a school system to serve children rather than the interests of competing factions of adults.

The priorities of the members and staff of New York ACORN in education emphasize four areas of activity: dealing problems at individual schools in ACORN neighborhoods; working with groups of parents interested in restructuring their children's schools or in starting new ones from scratch; conducting strategic policy analysis; and fighting for comprehensive, systemic change throughout the entire New York City Public Schools system.

This study and demands we raise in it are just the latest example of New York ACORN's ongoing efforts to make New York's public schools better for *all* of their students.

In 1996 ACORN members and volunteers visited schools across the city to document how parents are treated when they deal with the public schools. Their work was summarized in *Secret Apartheid: A Report on Racial Discrimination Against Black and Latino Parents and Children in the New York City Public Schools*, which describes extreme differences in the treatment, attention, and quality of information received by parents of color when they try to make informed decisions about their children's education. One of our conclusions was that this lack of information, especially with reference to specialized programs, means that children of color are more likely to be tracked into less challenging educational experiences with less skilled teachers and fewer resources.

The next year, we pursued the effects of tracking by examining the structural underpinnings of the historical exclusion of African American and Hispanic children from Stuyvesant, Bronx Science, and the few other elite academic high schools in New York City. ACORN parents and volunteers carried out a phone survey of schools and supplemented the meager information school personnel were willing to share with state and local data from a variety of sources. *Secret Apartheid II: Race, Regents, and Resources*, documented the fact that in districts where children of color make up most of the enrollment, few, if any, children have access to rigorous course work that would prepare them to do well on the Examination for the Special High Schools. Sadly, as we will demonstrate in this study, the middle school students of the city are still waiting for the curricular upgrade that will be necessary to level the playing field for entrance to what currently amount to publicly financed private schools.

This action research fueled a grass roots campaign which pushed the democratization of access to the range of programs in the schools forward on two fronts. First, in an almost immediate response to demands laid out in *Secret Apartheid*, the Chancellor directed all community school districts to submit comprehensive information about their "talented and gifted" programming. This information had never been assembled in one place. Many, though not all, districts complied, but 110 Livingston then refused to allow the public to review the actual surveys, choosing instead to make public a sanitized summary of the embarrassing and highly flawed reports. Pro bono attorneys from Davis Polk & Wardwell had to threaten legal action on ACORN's behalf before the Board would release even incomplete copies of the surveys.

Second, our evidence of the lack of equity in the treatment of parents captured the attention of the regional office of the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. Ultimately, the claim ACORN filed with OCR resulted in a resolution agreement with the Board of Education which compels the Board of Education to institute concrete measures to democratize access to information about the schools and their programs.

This spring, ACORN volunteers returned to the most problematic of the schools tested in 1996 and also visited several additional schools that have gifted programs the existence of which became more widely known with the release of the survey ordered by the Chancellor.

The results of this year's tests suggest that the Chancellor has flunked in terms of implementing the consent agreement he signed with the Federal government in which he committed the New York City Public Schools to provide equal access to information about schools and programs to all parents.

As offensive as that behavior continues to be, the more serious indictment raised by this report is the continued refusal of the school system to correct the widespread denial of rigorous, challenging course work to low income black and Latino children. With one outstanding exception (District 17), we found no evidence that school administrators are

moving toward more rigorous curriculum despite the mandates of the New York State Board of Regents that all public high school students must now be prepared for Regents examinations. Moreover, the reluctance of the Board of Education to turn over the actual surveys of gifted programs becomes more understandable when analysis of that data demonstrates that the enrollment in those programs is skewed away from African American and Latino participation even more deeply than we had previously understood.

Finally, to add insult to injury, some of these so-called gifted programs, which may be the only part of a district's curriculum that offers challenging, Regents oriented course work, take place in schools receiving state and federal magnet funding. This funding, which is intended to mitigate the isolation of racial minorities in the schools, is in some cases being spent by schools which are creating educational islands disproportionately populated by white students.

The current Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools has staked his professional reputation on two fundamental notions: standards and accountability.

He has issued policies to eliminate social promotion; instituted what he refers to as high quality summer school programs that focus on student literacy skills; and begun attempting to implement the nationally debated "new standards" which establish definitions of core content and skills which students must master and which teachers must teach. In theory, general adoption of the new standards would minimize tracking and, by extension, the need for the proliferation of so-called gifted programs.

In the process of stripping community school boards of many of their previous duties, the Chancellor has made it clear that the bucks stops at his desk when schools fail. Yet, two years after we presented hard evidence of the abuse of parents in the schools and a year after we carefully laid out how crippling tracking is happening on a scale so huge that students from entire community school districts are denied courses they need to prepare for a Regents diploma curriculum in high school, we see no progress on dealing with students or parents of color more equitably. What are the standards for the scores of gifted programs dotted about the city? What is the racial composition of these programs? What are the real admission criteria? Where are the programs located? When will an eighth grader begin taking courses she needs for the Examination for the Special High Schools?

Secret Apartheid III: Follow Up to Failure presents evidence that both accountability and standards -- of pedagogy and decency -- have been abandoned in the treatment of students of color in the New York City Public Schools.

METHODOLOGY

Three strands of investigation come together in this report:

- An examination of the *Survey For Programs Serving Gifted Students, Spring 1996* ordered by the Chancellor in response to grass roots pressure from ACORN and released to the public after legal pressure from ACORN's attorneys and an appraisal of the relationship between gifted programs and federal and state magnet funding.

- An investigation of the Board of Education's compliance with the consent agreement between the Board of Education and the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights.

- Research on the 1996-97 distribution of rigorous course work at the middle school level in a cross section of New York City community school districts.

Survey of Gifted Programs

With the assistance of Davis Polk & Wardwell, attorneys, we obtained copies of the actual program surveys submitted to the Board by community school districts. These had been briefly synopsized in *Programs Serving Gifted and Talented Students in New York City Public Schools 1995-96*, produced by the Board of Education Division of Assessment and Accountability. These surveys requested information for each talented and gifted (TAG) program run by a district and contained questions on the purpose, number of participants, racial breakdown, admissions standards, and approach to "giftedness" for each school based or district-wide program.

We attempted to summarize, then compare basic information about each program including location; grades covered; and the percentages of black, Latino, white and Asian children in each program and in the school or district where the program is operated. For district- wide programs, we used district totals, middle school totals, or elementary school totals depending on the most appropriate level of comparison.

We supplemented our summary with school and district population data from the *Annual School Census and Pupil Ethnic Composition Report* for the 1995-1996 school year, the same year covered by the Chancellor's survey as well as federal and state magnet funding information abstracted for us from NYC Board of Education *School Based Expenditure Reports, Fiscal Year 1996-97* by the New York University Institute for Education and Social Policy.

The surveys represent a highly flawed, but for better or worse, unique database. Of the 79 program surveys from 24 community school districts referenced in the Board's summary, ACORN was given 75 program surveys from 24 districts and none of the attachments to which some surveys refer for essential information. Based on tables in the Board's summary document, nearly 23 percent of the surveys (18) neglected to provided requested information regarding the racial break down of the programs.

Our inspection of the surveys revealed extensive instances in which district officials omitted total participation, ethnic breakdown, and even the names of the schools where programs were located. They sometimes refused to identify what tests were administered for admission. The reports contained numbers which were completely out of synch with central Board of Education school enrollment figures and led to absurdities such as 300 percent of the Latino students in a school being enrolled in its gifted program.

Nevertheless, even when incomplete responses are ruled out, a core of highly useful information was available to help us understand the composition of these programs better.

In addition to performing simple data sorts to clarify the relationships within and among gifted programs, we employed a parity index which consists of the ratio between the percentage of a gifted program represented by black, Latino, white, and asian students and the percentage of each of those groups in the school or appropriate district-wide category (e.g., all middle schools) with which a program is associated. We were able to establish a parity index for 63 programs.

This parity index provides a single indicator to determine if a particular group is represented in gifted programming in proportion to its overall percentage in the schoolwide or district enrollment (parity), underrepresented, or over represented.

For example, District 18, which has approximately 19,000 students, operates a district-wide gifted program (ASTRAL) for nearly 1,500 students. Latino students comprise about seven percent of District 18 enrollment and two percent of the ASTRAL program. The ratio of these two figures is .3, which tells us that Latinos are enrolled in that gifted program at about a third their level of enrollment for the district overall.

GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT	PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICT ENROLLMENT	GROUP PARITY INDEX
African-American	48%	78%	.6
Hispanic	2%	7%	.3
White	43%	11%	3.9
Asian	6%	%3	2.0

The next dimension of our analysis was to cross reference the schools with gifted programs and those schools that receive state and federal magnet grants. We were able to compare grant totals to relative parity in each school's program.

Compliance with OCR Agreement

To avoid further litigation on ACORN's OCR claim, the Board of Education agreed to institute a number of specific measures to ensure open and fair treatment of parents seeking information in public schools. These measures included:

- notices outlining district-wide programs and the district's non-discrimination policy, the name a district staff member designated to answer questions about those programs, and a designated person for each school who can answer parents questions about school programming;
- prominent posting in each district office and each public school of the notices;
- instructions to security personnel to direct inquiries regarding district programs to the designated person in the general office of each school;
- training for district office staff members and all school contact persons on the dissemination of information; and, specifically
- compliance of all contact personnel with the procedures outlined in the letter of agreement.[1]

[1] Documents from Board of Education-Office for Civil Rights agreement, *Access to Information About Schools and Programs*, September 1997.

ACORN recruited black, white, and Latina testers to play the role of parents -- which many of them are -- to monitor the Board of Education's compliance with the letter of agreement with the DOE Office for Civil Rights. In setting up our visits to the schools, we once again borrowed heavily from the model used by the Open Housing Center to test for discrimination in housing access.

Fifty-two visits were made to a non-random selection of 26 schools in ten districts to inquire about registering a child for kindergarten. Visits were made in the boroughs of the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens. Districts selected for testing generally have *total* student populations which are somewhat racially diverse. Specific schools fell into two categories: locations visited for *Secret Apartheid I* where there was a perceived difference in the treatment of white and black or Latino parents and new locations with gifted programs described in the district surveys discussed above.

Each tester was provided with general instructions for their test visit, a structured reporting questionnaire, and an open ended narrative form to summarize the sequence of each visit. (Sample materials are included in the appendix.) Testers arrived at schools unannounced. Then they sought information about the school and its kindergarten program. If asked for an address, they provided an address in or near the catchment area for the school or said that they were considering moving into the community.

Specifically, in their role as parents, testers were seeking information about the school's educational programs, in particular its kindergarten classes. Testers were instructed to move as far up the school hierarchy as possible, to attempt to visit classes, and to notice whether the official notice of programs was posted at the entrance, the security guard's desk, and the school office as stipulated by the OCR agreement.

Of the 52 visits made, 20 were made by white testers, 28 by African Americans, and four by the one Latina tester. After their visits, testers recorded their observations concerning the position of the person or persons with whom they spoke (secretary, principal, etc.), what questions school personnel asked the testers, how well school personnel answered testers' questions, whether or not testers were permitted to see classes, and how testers were treated.

The questionnaires and narratives were then subjected to a content analysis in which we tabulated:

- the position of the most senior person who interacted with each tester in a substantive manner,
- whether or not a tester was shown any classes,
- whether a tester was asked where he or she lived, and
- whether and how school personnel mentioned gifted programs.

The Distribution of Regents Oriented Courses

The New York ACORN Schools Office, in collaboration with New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy, analyzed school based data from the 1996-1997 school year to establish an updated comparison with similar information from the 1995-1996 school year). This analysis relied directly on the *Annual School Reports*, published by the New York City Public School System.

Using these reports, we re-examined the 86 middle schools in the 14 community school districts that comprised the earlier study, *Secret Apartheid II: Race, Regents, and Resources*. The districts were selected based on their historical performance of sending students to the science high schools, specifically the district that sent the highest and the lowest percentages of students. *Secret Apartheid II* documented that districts that offered Regents Math in eighth grade tended to have relatively low enrollments of black and Latino students and higher numbers of students graduating to the science high schools. Specifically, we looked at three indicators:

- First, we compared the number and percent of students tested in Regents Math in the eighth grade and the change in those variables from 1995-1996 to 1996-1997 in the selected schools.

According to an analysis provided to ACORN by the Washington D.C. based Education Trust, the domain of the course work for Regents Math closely correlates with the domain of the entrance examination for the science high schools. Therefore, schools that offer Sequential I Math to a relatively large number of their students prepare more students for the entrance exam.

- Next, we compared the number and percent of students tested in Regents Earth Science in the eighth grade and the change in those variables from 1995-1996 to 1996-1997 in the selected schools.

We selected Earth Science as an indicator of rigorous curriculum offered in the middle schools. Generally, those students who succeed on the entrance exam have been enrolled in challenging academic classes throughout their school years. If a student has taken the Earth Science Regents in middle school, we infer that the student has had access to rigorous course work in previous grades.

- Finally, we analyzed the selected districts' performance by comparing their outcomes in terms of individual and relative change.

We looked at changes in each of the selected districts in both the percent and the number of students who took Sequential I Math and Earth Science in the eighth grade and then compared those changes across districts. It is important to note changes in both percent and number because of the variation in size of the districts, neither variable alone paints a complete picture. For example, both District 2 and District 23 show a 4.2 percent increase in students taking Regents Math. However, in District 2, a total of 116 additional students took Regents Math, where in District 23 only 48 additional students took the course.

FINDINGS

Survey of Gifted Programs

Many districts and schools were clearly reluctant to describe completely the composition of their gifted classes.[2] Superintendents from six districts refused to respond to the survey. In addition, officials from two more districts claimed that although they operated SP programs, they did not have any gifted programs.[3]

Moreover, the central Board itself avoided thorny issues; ignoring urging from ACORN, the Chancellor did not include questions in his survey to determine how well gifted programs serve the attendance zone of the schools in which they are actually located. There were no questions to determine how many children come to programs from other parts of their district; nor does the survey determine how many children attend these programs from out of district by applying for variances. But any parent who belongs to the gifted program gossip circuit knows about car pools which run from Fort Greene to P.S. 114 in Canarsie or the bus service that is available to deliver kids from white neighborhoods in the Rockaways to Mark Twain Middle School in Coney Island.

However, even with the frequent omissions obviously intended to sabotage their usefulness, the surveys actually provide a much more complete picture of the exclusionary nature of many of these programs than was contained in the official digest of those surveys.

That summary of the Chancellor's survey of gifted programs admits that Latino children are "considerably underrepresented," then moves directly to the fact that white and other student groups are over represented, as if the two statements cancel out rather than reinforce each other.

---

[2] For some or all of their programs, Districts 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, and 30 did not provide either the total number of students in gifted programs, a breakdown of program enrollment by race, or both. The degree of this omission ranged from missing data for just two schools in District 2 to its absence for all district programs in CSD 22 and CSD 25.

[3] *Programs Serving Gifted and Talented Students in New York City Public Schools 1995-96*, a report from the Board of Education Division of Assessment and Accountability, page two.

Given that SP programs typically draw their students from at least the eighty-second percentile of standardized reading tests and the seventy-fifth percentile on the standardized math test -- and, in some cases, require a special test -- such an evasion appears both cynical and transparent.

The report disingenuously suggests that black children are represented in proportion to their overall numbers in the system.[4] Children, however, do not go to a "school system." They go to a school. Students from programs in districts overwhelmingly comprised of black and/or Latino children should not be used to obscure whether or not children of color are adequately represented in programs in statistically better integrated districts. A close reading of the district surveys, however, results in our first finding:

- Children of color are dramatically underrepresented in gifted programs throughout the system.

The parity index described under Methodology brings the focus down to the school level where it belongs by testing whether the composition of a gifted program roughly approximates the composition of the school or -- when the entire school is a gifted program -- the composition of the district. A value of less than 1.0 represents underrepresentation. A value greater than 1.0 indicates over representation. For purposes of this discussion, any parity index between .9 and 1.1 will constitute proportional representation. A data sort of information on the 63 talented and gifted program for which calculations could be performed reveals the following:

- Latino children are underrepresented in more than two thirds of the programs described by the surveys and occasionally over represented in a mere handful.

- At the same time, white children are over represented in half of the programs surveyed. White students are twice as likely to be over represented in a program as African American students and are over represented eight times more frequently than Latino students.

- Asian and black children are underrepresented in these programs almost twice as often as white children.

The following table summarizes the frequency of parity indexes for gifted programs covered by the Chancellor's survey. (A complete listing of the parity indexes for 63 programs is contained in the appendix.)

---

[4] Programs Serving Gifted and Talented Students in New York City Public Schools 1995-96, a report from the Board of Education Division of Assessment and Accountability, page 5.

SUMMARY OF PARITY INDEXES BY NUMBER OF PROGRAMS			
Group	Under Represented (less than .9)	Parity (.9 to 1.1)	Over Represented (greater than 1.1)
African American	25	22	16
Latino	43	16	4
White	14	15	32
Asian	25	14	23
White and Asian totals exclude programs for schools which had no enrollment from those groups.			

African American students were enrolled in just three gifted programs in percentages which were three or more times greater than their proportion of the larger student body to which they belonged. Latinos were represented in numbers greater than twice their rate of enrollment in the larger student body only one time. On the other hand, nine programs counted disproportionate participation from white students in rates ranging from three to nearly seven times their fraction of the larger student body.

Not only do the so-called gifted programs of the public schools exclude students of color in proportion to their numbers in the schools where the programs are located, they also tend to segregate white students. Ironically, almost all of the programs surveyed receive federal magnet school funding (36), state magnet funds (71), or both. The purpose of magnet funding from the state is to assist schools in "mov(ing) toward the prevention, reduction, and elimination of minority group isolation and segregation in district elementary and secondary schools."[5]

State regulations set up a dynamic which can inadvertently support inequities in gifted program participation. Magnet school plans are based on school-wide totals of minority and white students, but program funding must be spent only on expenses related to the so-called magnet program. This has created the possibility of setting up islands of white children in schools in which children of color are the majority and using those children to attract money for programs from which they do not benefit.

For example, IS 54 in District 3 had a school census of 1,424 students of whom 444 were in its gifted and talented program. The racial composition of the program was 35 percent African American, 20 percent Latino, 38 percent white, and seven percent Asian -- fairly integrated at first glance. However, when the break down of the school population, a figure not requested on the Chancellor's survey of gifted programs, is examined the picture

---

[5] New York State Education Department, Division of Civil Rights and Intercultural Relations: *GUIDELINES FOR MAGNET SCHOOL GRANT PROGRAMS*; July, 1990.

changes. The school's make-up is 41 percent African American, 42 percent Latino, 13 percent white, and three percent Asian. In other words, white students comprise the largest single groups in the gifted program despite their being only 13 percent of the student body.

A closer look reveals an even more disturbing fact: 169 or 88 percent of the school's white students are in the gifted program,leaving only 22 white children in a population of 980. The school has created a privileged island of segregation within its walls. This same school received over $100,000 in funds from a federal magnet schools grant.

In another instance, PS 105 in Brooklyn's District 20 is another school that segregates within its walls. White students make up 75 percent of the Delta Gifted Program but only 24 percent of the school census. An analysis of the actual number of students quickly reveals that all of this school's white students are in the gifted program

- In at least 14 gifted programs, between 50 and 100 percent of the school's white enrollment is in the gifted program.

- Among these schools are some of the City's top recipients of magnet school funding.

Five of the ten schools receiving federal magnet funding have at least half of their white enrollment concentrated in their magnet programs. A sixth has almost half (49 percent). These schools share over $600,000 in federal magnet money. Two other schools which concentrate 97 and 89 percent of their white students in gifted programs receive more than a third of a million dollars in state magnet funding.

The following table compares schools which are the top ten recipients of federal magnet money, have the top ten concentrations of white enrollment in gifted programs, or are both. Percentages in excess of 100 percent are assumed to indicate that all or most of a school's white students are in its gifted program. Enrollment percentages are based on figures provided by the districts in response to the Chancellor's survey of gifted programs.

CSD	SCHOOL	FEDERAL MAGNET FUNDING	STATE MAGNET FUNDING	% OF WHITE ENROLLMENT PARTICIPATING IN GIFTED PROGRAM	PARITY INDEX FOR WHITE ENROLLMENT
26	MS74	$330,878	$2,919	42%	*1.0
2	PS11	$175,216	$3,062	40%	1.5
2	IS167	$138,567	$7,586	0%	1.2
3	IS 54	$129,485	$3,964	88%	2.9
3	PS163	$128,446	$2,226	110%	3.3
2	PS104	$113,191	$63,221	49%	1.3
20	PS 105	$110,036	$4,400	122%	3.1
3	PS9	$99,301	$2,168	18%	1.1
3	PS145	$73,629	$2,374	58%	3.5
2	PS116	$59,035	$4,387	52%	1.5
3	PS208	$7,000	$858	112%	6.7
26	PS 162	$6,000	$72,520	97%	1.0
21	JH 239	$0	$274,166	89%	1.1
6	IS 223	$0	$1,145	100%	1.0
32	IS 383	$0	$2,700	99%	3.0
21	JH 96	$0	$2,336	64%	.8
13	JH 258	$0	$1,486	222%	**0.0

* Artificial result based on district reporting exactly equal percentages for overall students enrollment and gifted program enrollment.
** "0" indicates insufficient data provided.

According to attorneys with whom we have consulted, schools that receive magnet funding and also segregate white students into gifted programs are in violation of the spirit (if not the letter) of the legislative intent of magnet funding which is to decrease minority isolation. The disparate impact we have noted in these schools is unacceptable. Even if this segregation is not intentional, our attorneys suggest strongly that the courts must compel such schools to change their practices drastically and demonstrate representation in gifted programs that more closely resembles the racial composition of the schools.

Compliance with OCR Agreement

The overarching finding of this section of our study is that the Board of Education has not made even a good faith effort to live up to the commitments made to the DOE Office for Civil Rights.

In no visit, were testers directed to the trained, designated contact person specified by OCR. In no visit, did anyone identify him or herself as that person. On the average, people of color were allowed to speak with an educator and see classes less often than white testers. We documented 17 separate violations of the agreement and infer a significant additional number of violations.

- In 32 visits, African American and Latina testers succeeded in speaking with an educator (principal, teacher, etc.) four times (12.5 percent). Only one of the four was a principal.

- In 20 visits, white testers spoke with educators nine times (45 percent); six of these were principals.

- Four of the 32 visits (12.5 percent) by people of color resulted in their being allowed to visit or look in on classes while eight of the 20 visits by white testers included visit or a "peek" at a classroom (40 percent).

- In five visits, black or Hispanic testers were prevented from getting information from various school offices by security guards who refused them entry to the school; a white tester also encountered this problem.

- Not one single tester noted a posting in any school visited although they had been specifically instructed to look for signage. In eleven visits, testers specifically noted the *absence* of signage mandated by the OCR settlement to explain available programs. When one tester specifically asked a security guard, she was told that the sign had been taken down because it was end of the year; it is unclear that the guard was referring to the OCR mandated signage.

- Compared to the 1996 investigation of schools which prompted the OCR agreement, 1998 visits by testers who were people of color resulted in a slightly lower rate of classroom tours, a higher rate of security guard interference with parent inquiries, and a substantially lower success rate in actually speaking with educators about the schools. White testers fared about the same both years.

The following table summarizes key data which inform the findings section.

KEY VARIABLES BY RACE			
Variable	Total	White	People of Color
Testers	14	10	4
Visits[6]	52	20	32
Spoke with educator	13	9	4
Percent visits with educators	25%	45%	12.5%
Tours	10	7	3
Percent tours	19%	35%	9%
Asked for address	45 (90%)	15 (75%)	25 (83%)
Security guard blocked access	6	5	4

The Distribution of Regents Oriented Courses

The conclusions that the New York ACORN Schools Office drew from *Secret Apartheid II: Race, Regents and Resources* were clear. If successful entry to the science high schools -- a symbol of high academic achievement -- is based on rigorous course work, the way to increase the number of students from the low-performing, low-income black and Latino districts is to beef up the curriculum in these schools. If success on the entrance exam is based on a strong mathematics background and closely correlated to Sequential I Math, then it follows that students must have access to this course in their middle schools.

Our primary focus has been to demand that the Chancellor require all schools to adopt standards for all subjects beginning with math to ensure that at each grade level all students in the system have an opportunity to learn challenging material that prepares them for the next grade. We believe that if all schools make rigorous academic course work widely available, it will provide the opportunity for more black and Latino students to be more successful on the entrance exam. Moreover, such course work is now supposed to the order of the day, at least in New York State.

---

[6] The visit by race of tester is the basic unit of comparison in the text.

In April of 1996, pursuing what they claim is "an effort to raise the learning standards for all students," the New York State Board of Regents mandated a phased in adoption of Regents Examinations as the standard assessment for all New York State public school students.[7] In both *Learning Standards for Mathematics, Science, and Technology (Revised Edition March 1996)* and *Learning Standards for English Language Arts (Revised Edition March 1996)*, the New York State Education Department makes it very clear that these new standards are to be applied to *all* public school students. New York City high school students will find themselves unprepared for the new, tougher standards unless they have course work in middle school and earlier that lays the foundation for high school Regents level work.

This sea change in the way public schools must operate adds to the sense of urgency and frustration which we brought to this most recent inventory of what is missing from our local middle schools.

Ultimately our findings are simple. With the exception of one district -- Community School District 17 -- in the districts selected as the most and least successful at sending students to the science high schools *there was no significant change in the distribution of rigorous curriculum in the city's middle schools between our first look at this issue and this spring*. We infer that there was no significant change in the composition of the freshman classes for the 1997-1998 school year at Stuyvesant and Bronx Science. (Despite a number of requests both from the ACORN Schools Office and the NYU Institute for Education and Social Policy, the Board of Education did not release any data regarding the districts which sent their students to the science high schools for the current school year.)

- In the 1996-1997 school year, 20 percent (17 of 86) of the middle schools in the selected districts failed to offer Sequential I Math and 52 percent (45 of 86) fail to offer Regents Earth Science.

New York City's public school students must be given the opportunity to enroll in the challenging course work that will prepare them not only for the entrance exam to the science high schools but which will also prepare them for the new Regents high school standards. The failure of so many schools to offer rigorous math and science classes demonstrates that another school year passed without significant changes in curriculum.

The number of schools that offer Sequential I Math is up slightly from 1995-1996 to 1996-1997 -- from 64 to 69 schools, however the number of schools that offer Earth Science

---

[7] *Regents Approve Elimination Of Regents Competency Tests* (RCT), New York State Education Department, July 26, 1996.

is down by 2 -- from 42 to 41. Ultimately, this course work should be offered in all schools to a substantial majority of the students.

Comparative Analysis by District of Number of Schools with Eighth Grade Students Tested in Regents Math and Regents Earth Science							
CSD	# of Middle Schools	Schools w/ Students Tested in Regents Math, 1995-96	Schools w/ Students Tested in Regents Math, 1996-97	Increase/ Decrease between 1996 and 1997	Schools Testing for Regents Science, 1995-96	Schools Testing for Regents Science, 1996-97	Increase/ Decrease between 1996 and 1997
2	14	9	10	+1	5	6	+1
7	6	1	2	+1	1	0	-1
9	8	5	5	0	1	2	+1
12	4	1	4	+3	1	0	-1
16	1	1	0	-1	2	2	0
17	6	5	6	+1	2	2	0
19	7	6	5	-1	3	2	-1
21	7	6	7	+1	6	6	0
23	4	3	3	0	3	2	-1
24	6	6	6	0	6	5	-1
25	7	7	7	0	6	6	0
26	5	5	5	0	3	3	0
28	6	5	5	0	3	4	+1
32	5	4	4	0	1	1	0
Total	86	64	69	+5	43	41	-2

- Even in schools that offer Sequential I Math to eighth graders, in 52 percent of those schools (36 of 69) the course is only available to one class of students on the grade level.

A deeper analysis of the schools which *do* offer Regents Math and Regents Science indicates that frequently the course is only offered to a small number of students. Of the 69 schools in which students were tested in Regents Math, 36 schools had fewer than 33 students who took the test. (See chart in the Appendix). We can infer that the course is taught to one class of students -- typically the gifted or SP (special progress) track in the school. In our previous report, New York ACORN demonstrated that information about and access to those classes is less available to black and Latino students and parents. For this reason, if Sequential I Math is not made more widely available, black and Latino students will have less opportunity to take the class than other students.

- Four of the five districts that have the highest percentage of students tested in Regents Math and Regents Earth Science have the lowest percentage of black and Latino students. Five of the six districts with the lowest percentage of students tested have the highest percentage of black and Latino students. The one exception to this finding is Community School District 17 in Brooklyn.

The following chart ranks the selected school districts from lowest to highest percentage of eighth grade students tested in Regents Math. It also lists the percentage tested in Regents Science, a figure which correlates very closely. In the top performing districts, which are historically the ones that send the most students to the science high schools, the racial composition is less than 52 percent black and Latino with the important exception of Community School District 17. In this school year, Community School District 17 was under new leadership introduced and rigorous curriculum in all of the CSD 17 schools. In many ways, we believe that this district is a model because it has increased the availability of rigorous course work for a large percentage of its students.

Five of the six districts that have sent the fewest students to the science high schools have the lowest percentages of students tested in Regents Math and Earth Science also have the highest percentages of black and Latino students. Most notable among these districts is Community School District 16 in which no students in the entire district were tested in Regents Math or Earth Science. The demographics of these districts do not vary widely from those of Community School District 17 -- although the number of students receiving free lunch in C.S.D. 17 is somewhat lower. We believe that just as District 17's schools have begun to offer rigorous course work to the majority of their students, the low-performing districts must begin to do the same.

Performance by District in Percent of Students Tested in Regents Math and Regents Science in 1996-1997 School Year				
CSD	% Students Tested in Math	% Students Tested in Science	% Black and Latino	% Free Lunch
16	0.0%	0.0%	97.3%	90.9%
7	3.5%	0.0%	98.0%	90.7%
9	5.7%	1.7%	97.4%	86.3%
19	4.7%	1.2%	89.1%	84.7%
12	10.0%	1.8%	95.7%	84.1%
23	10.5%	8.4%	97.4%	88.4%
24	11.5%	5.9%	56.0%	68.3%
32	12.2%	3.9%	97.0%	79.1%
28	21.9%	10.2%	66.4%	55.4%
21	25.6%	22.3%	26.8%	68.4%
2	29.4%	18.9%	51.9%	52.8%
17	34.8%	4.3%	95.7%	81.7%
25	36.5%	26.4%	30.8%	42.4%
26	45.6%	13.1%	25.4%	21.8%

CONCLUSIONS

The core conclusion of Secret Apartheid III is that black and Latino children in the New York City Public Schools are increasingly isolated from the information and the opportunities to pursue rigorous course work. This position flows from a number of specific conclusions based on the findings just described.

- Gifted programs, the only classes in some districts which offer anything approaching a challenging educational program systematically exclude a disproportionate number of African American and Hispanic children.

- In schools receiving substantial funding from federal and state magnet school programs, white children appear to be concentrated in segregated programs; this appears to violate the spirit if not the letter of the legislative intent for this funding.

- With the exception of the availability of various types (and quality) of printed material available in *some* schools *if* a parent can get past the security guard, there has been little substantial progress in removing the barriers to parents of color who need information about educational programs for their children.

- The Board of Education is in violation of its agreement with the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights.

- With the exception of Community School District 17 in Brooklyn, there appears to have been no substantial increase in the availability in middle schools of rigorous course work of the type that would prepare students for Regents level work or for receiving a competitive score on the Admissions Examinations for the Special High Schools. For example, entire districts still offer only one or two classes of students the opportunity to take Sequential I Math. This is despite the fact that the Board of Regents have placed all public schools in New York State on a tight timeline for converting all course work to Regents level curricula.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report is yet another installment in the efforts of ACORN members to persuade the Chancellor and Board of Education and major elected officials to recognize the pernicious impact of district wide and individual tracking on the educational success of our children.

Entire districts remain without Regents-oriented course work. Our children are underrepresented in the dozens of gifted programs which often provide the only access to challenging educational experiences. At least 43 of these so-called gifted programs include kindergarten and even pre-kindergarten enrollment as if academic potential should be parsed, dissected, and *tracked* before children even start school.

We call on the Chancellor and the Board of Education to take the following steps:

- To address the difficulty black and Latino parents have in obtaining information about schools their children might attend, the Board of Education should contract with a community based organization to operate a "Choice Clearinghouse" where information about all New York City schools and programs will be centralized and available in a user-friendly format to interested parents.

It is intolerable that such information is still not available at the school level from well informed, courteous public employees, but, as this study has documented once again, in too many cases it is not. Until it is, a Choice Clearinghouse is an important tool for redressing at least one dimension of the inequitable distribution of educational resources.

New York ACORN is uniquely qualified to operate such a clearinghouse. ACORN has years of expertise in demystifying essential information that parents need to make decisions about their children's education. ACORN has the experience organizing parents in neighborhoods across the city to work for better schools. Our leadership and staff visit low income parents of color on a daily basis. We have extensive experience in providing other informational services such as our nationally recognized Loan Counseling Program.

- Tracking in the New York City Public Schools must be phased out, beginning immediately with tracking in kindergarten-3.

We have clearly demonstrated the failure of the schools to treat parents of color in an equitable manner and give them sound information about programs and schools. We have amassed additional evidence showing the school systems failure to comply with the Office for Civil Rights resolution agreement.

< Page 27 >

We believe that these failures demonstrate that tracking at the pre-K/K level when children -- and many parents -- are new to the system must cease immediately. We also believe that the adoption of rigorous course work for all students will ultimately eliminate any excuse for tracking in later grades.

- Course work that prepares middle school students to do well in an academically superior high school and to be able to compete on the Examination for the Special High Schools should be established as the norm in all middle schools beginning next fall.

Beginning in the 1998-99 school year, the Chancellor should require all schools to adopt common minimum standards for all subjects beginning with math to ensure that at each grade level all students in the system have an opportunity to learn challenging material that prepares them for the next grade.

ACORN has demonstrated not once, but twice that districts serving low income children of color do not provide challenging course work to all or even most of their students. Parents across the city are tired of seeing their kids dummied down by curricula that teach to some imagined lowest common denominator. In addition, the New York State Board of Regents has already put a schedule in place to convert all high school courses to Regents level work over the next few years. It is time for the Board members to stop dragging their feet and end a generation of great high schools for the fortunate few and mediocre to poor schools for the rest.

To begin closing the gulf between the science high schools and middle schools in the districts which send few if any students to them, Stuyvesant, Bronx Science, and the handful of other top performing high schools should establish corridor relationships with middle schools and their feeder elementary schools in nearby districts.

We will assist the Chancellor in identifying a group of under-performing middle schools near each specialized school. A community-educator task force will be charged with creating ways to implement the necessary curriculum reform and staff development to bring students in those schools to a level of competency at which they can compete fairly for admission to their partner schools.

Supplementary resources must be provided to fund these relationships. Corridor activities might include teacher mentor programs, coordinated curriculum development, staff development for district schools on subjects and content which prepare students to succeed in a high school with high standards and expectations, student tutoring programs, test preparation programs for the admissions test, and motivational visits for elementary school students to the high schools.

- Concrete steps must be taken immediately in the outreach and selection process for all public school gifted programs to ensure that their racial composition reflects the school and community in which the programs are located.

Our work trying to pry information out of schools which still post security guards at the door to keep parents out and our analysis of the widespread underrepresentation of African American and Latino children in dozens of gifted programs challenges any claim that such programs admit students solely on academic merit. Information is key. Academic preparation is essential. Low income parents are often denied the first. Entire districts of low income kids are denied the second.

We are not calling for a lowering of standards. We are calling for a level playing field of both information and preparation in which all parents can know about all such programs and children can compete for admission on entrance requirements calling on academic skills and subject matter which all children have an opportunity to learn.

We further call upon the Chancellor to monitor these programs to ensure that these changes are actually made.

- We call on the Auditor General of the U.S. Department of Education and the New York State Comptroller to investigate the expenditure of federal and state magnet monies in the New York City Public Schools.

The expenditure of federal and state magnet money in such close proximity to islands of white students segregated from their peers is a deeply disturbing coincidence. The appropriate public officials must ensure that these funds are not being used to further segregate our schools.

APPENDIX

PARITY INDEXES

The following table summarizes the parity indexes for the gifted programs reported to the Chancellor's survey. A zero in all four index cells for a row indicates that the district failed to report sufficient information to perform the calculation. Some zeros and any positive value indicate very small or no numbers of students in the gifted programs. ERR in less than four cells indicates no enrollment from that group in the school. Ellipses (...) indicate that there are addition schools in a program.

CSD	SCHOOL	PROGRAM	PARITY INDEX			
			AF-AM	Latino	WHITE	ASIAN
2	IS 104	SP/Adv	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.2
2	ESMS	ACAD C	0.4	0.5	2.4	0.6
2	LAB	ALL SU	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	PS 124	G/T	2.0	1.0	4.7	0.9
2	PS 116	TAG	0.6	0.6	1.5	0.9
2	PS 6	ACC CL	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
2	PS 11	GIFTED	0.8	0.5	1.5	2.2
2	PS 167	SPE	1.2	0.9	1.2	0.7
2	Lower L	ALL	1.1	0.9	2.4	0.2
3	PS 163	G/T MA	0.9	0.8	3.3	0.7
3	PS 145	G/T MAP	1.3	0.7	3.5	2.0
3	PS 185	G/T MA	1.1	0.6	0.0	0.0
3	PS 208	G/T MA	1.1	0.6	6.7	6.7
3	PS 9	G/T MA	1.4	0.6	1.1	0.8
3	IS 54	DELTA	0.9	0.5	2.9	2.3
4	PS 108	MAD AV	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.0
4	PS 825	T/G	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4	PS 83	GP	1.8	0.7	0.0	0.0
4	PS 83	BIL GP	0.5	1.3	0.0	0.0

CSD	SCHOOL	PROGRAM	PARITY INDEX			
			AF-AM	Latino	WHITE	ASIAN
4	PS 171	PREP S	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.7
5	DIST	TAG	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.0
6	IS 223	Math S	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.8
9	PS 42	ALL SU	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.0
9	PS 2	ART	0.2	2.6	0.0	0.0
11	PS153/J1 81	GP	0.8	0.6	2.5	2.7
12	116/158	AIM	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13	JHS 113	Theta/	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13	P.S. 3,	LEAD	1.0	0.8	4.0	0.1
13	JHS 258		0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
14	PS 132	G/T	3.0	0.7	1.0	0.0
17	DIST, elem	Acc Pr	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18	PS 235	SOAR	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18	PS 233	SOAR	1.0	0.8	0.0	0.0
18	DIST, elem	Javits	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
18	DIST 18	AstralP	0.6	0.3	3.9	2.0
18	279	ALERT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
18	135	STAR	1.0	1.3	0.0	0.0
19	DIST		1.3	0.5	3.5	1.7
20	DIST, mid	Talent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20	DIST, mid	SP	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CSD	SCHOOL	PROGRAM	PARITY INDEX			
			AF-AM	Latino	WHITE	ASIAN
20	DIST, mid	Gifted	0.5	0.3	1.7	1.5
20	PS 105	Delta	3.0	0.4	3.1	0.3
21	JHS 303	SIGMA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21	JHS 228	Magnet	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.0
21	PS 99...	SIGMA	0.6	0.5	1.8	1.2
21	PS 238	SIGMA	0.3	0.2	1.5	1.3
21	IS 801	Sci/Ma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21	JHS 239	Mark Twain	0.9	0.9	1.1	0.9
21	JHS 96	MASTER	2.5	0.7	0.8	0.6
22	DIST, mid	IS Cen	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22	DIST?, elem	Ctr at	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22	DIST, elem	Eagle	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
22	IS 240	Math/S	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25	JHS 25...	7th Gr	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25	P.S.20,	IGC	0.8	0.7	0.9	1.3
25	PS 165...	Alpha	0.4	0.3	1.1	1.6
26	PS 115	TAG	1.2	0.7	1.1	0.9
26	PS 221	IGC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26	MS 74	SPE	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
26	MS 74	TAG	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
26	PS 162	TAG	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
26	PS 188	Scienc	0.3	0.1	0.7	2.2

CSD	SCHOOL	PROGRAM	PARITY INDEX			
			AF-AM	Latino	WHITE	ASIAN
26	PS 31...	Gifted	0.3	0.4	1.5	0.7
27	District	EnrichP	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1
27	IS 53	Adv Ln	1.0	1.2	0.3	0.2
27	JHS 180	Sch Re	0.5	0.6	1.8	2.0
27	PS 62	ACE	0.9	0.7	1.8	1.0
27	PS 60	IGC	0.3	0.6	1.8	1.2
27	PS 100	IGC	0.8	0.8	2.2	1.1
27	PS 114	IGC	0.1	0.2	1.1	0.3
27	PS 64	ACE	0.5	0.9	1.2	1.4
27	PS 64...	Project Strength	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.9
27	PS 56,	ASTRE	0.8	0.6	2.3	1.3
27	202,210, 226	Gifted	0.5	0.5	2.3	2.0
27	202,210, 226	Talent	0.8	0.6	1.6	1.5
28	District	Gifted	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.0
29	PS 176	Gifted	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30	PS 150	IGC	3.5	0.3	1.2	1.4
30	PS 122	IG	0.4	0.5	1.1	1.5
32	IS 383	G/T	1.5	0.6	3.0	3.0

SAMPLE OF CHANCELLOR'S SURVEY OF GIFTED PROGRAMS

The following pages provide an example of the survey of gifted programs in the New York City Public Schools.

SURVEY FOR PROGRAMS SERVING GIFTED STUDENTS:
Spring, 1996

We are interested in learning about programs serving gifted and talented students in each of the elementary and middle schools in your district (pre-kindergarten to grade 8). Please complete these questions as they relate to each gifted and talented program in each school, and return this survey to the Division of Assessment and Accountability (D.A.A.), at 110 Livingston St., Room 740, Brooklyn, NY 11201 by June 21, 1996. (Duplicate this form as needed.) Also, please enclose a brief description (one-half page) of each program, as well as a sample of the information typically provided to parents, along with this survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to call Dr. Lori Mei or Judith Eisler of D.A.A. at (718) 935-3772. Thank you for your cooperation.

Name of Person Answering Survey_____ CSD # 26 (1-2)

Tel. #: (718) 631-6966

1. School #: PS 31,221 OR IS/JHS 67, 158 (3-6)

2. Does this program serve: (Check only one)

___X___ a. Intellectually Gifted students in a program with a specific content focus, and selection criteria or application procedures

_____ b. Students in Intellectually Gifted Child/Special Progress (IGC/SP) classes

_____ c. Students in a Talent (e.g., performing arts) program with a specific content focus, and selection criteria or application procedures (7)

3. Program Name GIFTED MAGNET PROGRAM

4. Content Area ALL - Self Contained Classes

5. Mission/Goals To enable gifted students to realize their maximum potential when appropriatelychallenged and special learning styles are recognized.

---

6. Grade levels served by this program in 1995-96 (Check all that apply):

_____ a. Pre-K	(8)	___X___ f. Grade 4	(13)
___X___ b. Kindergarten	(9)	___X___ g. Grade 5	(14)
___X___ c. Grade 1	(10)	___X___ h. Grade 6	(15)
___X___ d. Grade 2	(11)	___X___ i. Grade 7	(16)
___X___ e. Grade 3	(12)	___X___ j. Grade 8	(17)

7. Total number of students in this program in 1995-96 550 (18-20)

8. Description of students in this program in 1995-96 (Write in "0" if Not Applicable: To Total 100%):

a. Black	003 % (21-23)	d. Asian (include Indian subcontinent)	026 % (30-32)
b. Hispanic	004 % (24-26)	e. Nat. Amer.	000 % (33-35)
c. White	067 % (27-29)	f. Other	000 % (36-38)

9a. Are there opportunities for Limited English Proficient students to participate in this program?

___X___ 1. Yes _____ 2. No (39)

9b. IF NO: Please explain why not.

IF YES: (Please answer Questions 9c-9e)

9c. Is the application process the same for these students?

_____ 1. Yes ___X___ 2. No (40)

9d. Please describe any differences.

Pre-kindergarten children who score in the very superior range on the performance sub-test (non-verbal) of the I.Q. test who are bilingual are accepted into the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9a. Number of LEP students in program in 1995-96 02 (41-42)

10a. Are there opportunities for Special Education students to participate in this program?

X 1. Yes ___ 2. No (43)

10b. IF NO: Please explain why not.

IF YES: (Please answer Questions 10c-10e)

10c. Is the application process the same for these students?

~~N/A~~ 1. Yes ~~N/A~~ 2. No (44)

10d. Please describe any differences.

10e. Number of Special Education students in program in 1995-96: 00 (45-46)

11. What procedures do schools follow when parents inquire about this program?

a. on the telephone:

Secretary answers questions and mails Fact Sheet (Attachment #1)

b. in person:

parents' questions are answered and Fact Sheets are distributed.

12a. Are any pre-screening devices used to determine who is eligible to apply to this program? (e.g., test scores, attendance, behavior)

___ 1. Yes X 2. No (47)

12b. IF YES: Please explain.

13a. Are citywide tests used to select students for this program?

X 1. Yes ___ 2. No (48)

13b. IF YES: What tests are used and what level of performance must students achieve in order to be considered for admission to this program?

Tests Used	Required Level of Performance
CTB Reading	98 - 99 percentile
CAT Math	98 - 99 percentile

14a. Are any district-/school-developed, or commercially produced tests (e.g., Stanford-Binet, etc.) used to select students for this program?

X 1. Yes ___ 2. No (4

14b. IF YES: What tests are used and what level of performance must studen achieve in order to be considered for admission to this program? (DATA WILL NOT BE REPORTED BY SCHOOL OR DISTRICT)

Tests Used	Required Level of Performance
Stanford Binet IV	Top ranking scores (129 and up)
WISC	Top ranking scores (varies)

15a. Are any other tests used in the selection process?

___ 1. Yes X 2. No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

22. What responsibilities are parents/guardians expected to assume during the school year? (Check all that apply)

____	1a. Purchase materials or supplies	1b. Amount $____	(102-105)
____	2a. Pay material fee	2b. Amount $____	(106-109)
____	3a. Pay _____ (other)	3b. Amount $____	(110-113)
X	4. Attend program activities		(114)
____	5. Assist with assignments		(115)
____	6. Other _____ (please specify)		(116)

23a. What is the definition or basic understanding of the concept of "giftedness" for this program?

1) Performance on I.Q. Test (pre-kindergarten)
2) Performance on I.Q. Test , recommendation of teacher, principal (grades 1, 2, 3) - see attachment #3.
3) Performance on citywide achievement tests (reading, math) and teacher, principal recommendation - see attachment #3.

23b. What assumptions underlie the overall approach to meeting the educational needs of children in this program? (e.g., What specific learning objectives and instructional strategies guide the design of this program?)

Gifted students have special needs and learning styles.
Gifted students analyze, criticize, generalize, synthesize and evaluate when there is provision for curriculum compacting and stimulation/challenge.

24. What are the sources and amount of funding for this program? (Check all that apply)

X	1a. Tax-levy allocation	1b. Amount $____	(117-122)
____	2a. Reimbursable funds	2b. Amount $____	(123-128)
____	3a. Legislative grants	3b. Amount $____	(129-134)
____	4a. Competitive grants	4b. Amount $____	(135-140)
____	5a. Other _____ (Please specify)	5b. Amount $____	(141-146)

INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS ONLY

25a. How many of the students who participated in this program in this school sat for entrance exams for the four specialized high schools (Stuyvesatant, Bronx High School of Science, LaGuardia High School, Brooklyn Technical) during the 1995-96 school year?

Ø30 (147-149)

25b. How many of the students who took these exams were accepted?

Not Known at this time (150-152)

Did not keep track

Superintendent's Signature

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Comparative Analysis of Select Districts' Performance

(Districts 2, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23-26, 28, 32)

Change in Percent of Students Taking Science Regents Test in 8th Grade

1996 and 1997

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
102070	O HENRY SCHOOL	137	0	0.0	0.0	114	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	76.1	80.4
102104	SIMON BARUCH SCHOOL	347	77	22.2	85.7	295	66	22.4	81.8	-11	0.2	38.4	54.7
102131	DR SUN YAT SEN SCHOOL	477	67	14.0	62.7	424	61	14.4	70.5	-6	0.3	12.8	90.4
102167	ROBERT WAGNER SCHOOL	401	70	17.5	95.7	470	138	29.4	95.7	68	11.9	30.2	17.9
102218	ROOSEVELT ISLAND SCHOOL	59	17	28.8	76.5	67	19	28.4	94.7	2	-0.5	72.1	56.7
102877	LAB UPPER SCHOOL	89	85	95.5	81.2	104	78	75.0	82.1	-7	-20.5	23.6	19.8
102878	SCHOOL OF THE FUTURE	77	0	0.0	0.0	63	1	1.6	100.0	1	1.6	60.5	66.7
102881	CLINTON SCHOOL	68	0	0.0	0.0	69	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	45.0	31.6
102882	EAST SIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL	82	0	0.0	0.0	108	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	28.7	12.5
102887	SCHOOL FOR THE PHYSICAL CITY	42	0	0.0	0.0	56	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	53.5	24.8
102889	NYC MUSEUM SCHOOL	58	0	0.0	0.0	59	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	44.1	14.9
102891	SALK SCHOOL OF SCIENCES					50	8	16.0	100.0			36.4	39.4
102892	ADOLPH OCHS					65	0	0.0	0.0			85.0	91.7
102893	RIIS UPPER SCHOOL FOR LABOR					24	0	0.0	0.0			69.4	87.4
102894	P S DANCE SCHOOL					0	0	0.0	0.0			68.6	58.0
102895	ELIAS HOWE MIDDLE SCHOOL					0	0	0.0	0.0			85.5	97.3
Total for District 2		**1837**	**316**	**17.2**		**1968**	**371**	**18.9**		**55**	**1.8**		

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
207139	ALEXANDER BURGER SCHOOL	287	0	0.0	0.0	289	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.9	93.1
207149	ELIJAH D. CLARK SCHOOL	219	57	26.0	29.8	203	0	0.0	0.0	-57	-26.0	97.9	84.3
207151	HENRY LOU GEHRIG SCHOOL	150	0	0.0	0.0	149	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.3	86.1
207162	LOLA RODRIGUEZ DE TIO ACADEMY OF FUTURE TECH.	271	0	0.0	0.0	230	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	99.0	91.1
207183	PAUL ROBESON SCHOOL	230	0	0.0	0.0	234	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.1	94.5
207184	RAFAEL CORDERO Y MOLINA SCHOOL	257	0	0.0	0.0	290	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.9	95.0
Total for District 7		**1414**	**57**	**4.0**		**1395**	**0**	**0.0**		**-57**	**-4.0**		
209022	JORDAN L. MOTT SCHOOL	408	0	0.0	0.0	312	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	94.9	88.3
209082	ALEXANDER MACOMBS SCHOOL	338	21	6.2	61.9	293	14	4.8	100.0	-7	-1.4	99.3	92.5
209117	JOSEPH H. WADE SCHOOL	384	0	0.0	0.0	351	27	7.7	14.8	27	7.7	98.0	89.6
209145	ARTURO TOSCANINI SCHOOL	347	0	0.0	0.0	367	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.0	90.8
209147	DIANA SANDS SCHOOL	491	0	0.0	0.0	490	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.8	84.0
209148	CHARLES R. DREW SCHOOL	248	0	0.0	0.0	218	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	99.1	95.5
209166	ROBERTO CLEMENTE SCHOOL	315	0	0.0	0.0	309	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	94.1	81.9
209229	DR. ROLAND N. PATTERSON SCHOOL	150	0	0.0	0.0	137	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.9	72.0
Total for District 9		**2681**	**21**	**0.8**		**2477**	**41**	**1.7**		**20**	**0.9**		
212098	FLAGS (HERMAN RIDDER CAMPUS) SCHOOL	204	0	0.0	0.0	191	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	95.1	80.0
212116	RAFAEL HERNANDEZ SCHOOL	456	0	0.0	0.0	337	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	95.6	85.6
212158	THEODORE ROOSEVELT GATHINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	348	0	0.0	0.0	288	20	6.9	80.0	20	6.9	95.5	85.0

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

Source: Annual School Reports, NYC Public School

Prepared by New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy, June 1998

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
212200	LORRAINE HANSBERRY ACADEMY	349	0	0.0	0.0	280	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.6	85.9
Total for District 12		**1357**	**0**	**0.0**		**1096**	**20**	**1.8**		**20**	**1.8**		
316324	SARAH GARNETT SCHOOL	432	14	3.2	78.6	396	0	0.0	0.0	-14	-3.2	98.7	91.2
316835	W.E.B.DUBOIS SCHOOL OF MUSIC		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.2	84.6
316881	SCH. OF JOURNALISM, LITERARY STUD. & FINE ARTS		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	95.9	97.0
Total for District 16		**432**	**14**	**3.2**		**396**	**0**	**0.0**		**-14**	**-3.2**		
317002	M.S. 2	127	0	0.0	0.0	423	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	94.5	100.0
317022	P.S. 22		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.4	100.0
317061	ATWELL GLADSTONE SCHOOL	532	21	3.9	95.2	461	26	5.6	50.0	5	1.7	94.0	74.5
317246	WALT WHITMAN SCHOOL	420	0	0.0	0.0	466	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.8	65.5
317320	JACKIE ROBINSON SCHOOL	519	0	0.0	0.0	477	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	93.8	85.8
317390	MAGGIE WALKER SCHOOL	428	64	15.0	23.4	506	92	18.2	44.6	28	3.2	96.0	71.1
317391	MAHALIA JACKSON SCHOOL	402	0	0.0	0.0	392	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.9	75.3
Total for District 17		**2428**	**85**	**3.5**		**2725**	**118**	**4.3**		**33**	**0.8**		
319166	GEORGE GERSHWIN SCHOOL	403	8	2.0	100.0	394	7	1.8	100.0	-1	-0.2	95.9	75.3
319171	ABRAHAM LINCOLN SCHOOL	288	0	0.0	0.0	254	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	88.9	96.4
319218	JAMES PETER SINNOTT MAGNET SCHOOL	339	0	0.0	0.0	400	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.1	84.5
319292	MARGARET S. DOUGLAS SCHOOL	402	0	0.0	0.0	344	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.1	92.8
319302	RAFAEL CORDERO Y MOLINA SCHOOL	512	0	0.0	0.0	441	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	90.9	87.4

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
319364	GATEWAY SCHOOL	232	18	7.8	100.0	226	19	8.4	100.0	1	0.6	76.3	73.0
319409	EAST NY FAMILY ACADEMY	44	1	2.3	100.0	41	0	0.0	0.0	-1	-2.3	96.8	83.3
Total for District 19		**2220**	**27**	**1.2**		**2100**	**26**	**1.2**		**-1**	**0.0**		
321043	JAMES REYNOLDS SCHOOL	357	62	17.4	90.3	427	95	22.2	77.9	33	4.9	36.6	79.0
321096	SETH LOW SCHOOL	388	27	7.0	96.3	391	33	8.4	97.0	6	1.5	28.2	72.4
321098	BAY ACADEMY FOR ARTS AND SCIENCES		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	18.7	
321228	DAVID A. BOODY SCHOOL	386	34	8.8	97.1	462	119	25.8	65.5	85	16.9	30.0	70.5
321239	MARK TWAIN SCHOOL	376	109	29.0	100.0	346	110	31.8	99.1	1	2.8	13.0	30.1
321280	BROOKLYN STUDIO SECONDARY SCHOOL		0	0.0	0.0	74	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	21.0	81.1
321281	JOSEPH CAVALLARO SCHOOL	395	133	33.7	72.2	356	93	26.1	87.1	-40	-7.5	32.3	73.2
321303	GEORGE C. TILYOU SCHOOL	260	72	27.7	45.8	217	57	26.3	64.9	-15	-1.4	34.3	72.3
Total for District 21		**2162**	**437**	**20.2**		**2273**	**507**	**22.3**		**70**	**2.1**		
323055	OCEANHILL BROWNSVILLE SCHOOL	183	22	12.0	13.6	204	53	26.0	1.9	31	14.0	96.8	77.0
323263	ESTHER C. HUNTER SCHOOL	244	0	0.0	0.0	194	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.7	100.0
323271	JOHN M. COLEMAN SCHOOL	231	21	9.1	61.9	287	30	10.5	36.7	9	1.4	97.6	76.7
323275	THELMA J. HAMILTON SCHOOL	239	1	0.4	0.0	308	0	0.0	0.0	-1	-0.4	97.5	100.0
Total for District 23		**897**	**44**	**4.9**		**993**	**83**	**8.4**		**39**	**3.5**		
424061	LEONARDO DA VINCI SCHOOL	733	27	3.7	77.8	718	21	2.9	95.2	-6	-0.8	83.9	73.4
424073	WILLIAM COWPER INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	882	85	9.6	100.0	876	92	10.5	100.0	7	0.9	56.5	71.2

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

Source: Annual School Reports, NYC Public School

Prepared by New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy, June 1998

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
424077	I.S. 77	303	27	8.9	100.0	417	24	5.8	95.8	-3	-3.2	67.3	80.4
424093	RIDGEWOOD INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	479	28	5.8	100.0	493	0	0.0	0.0	-28	-5.8	53.3	73.5
424119	GLENDALE SCHOOL	313	33	10.5	97.0	294	35	11.9	88.6	2	1.4	22.3	37.0
424125	WOODSIDE SCHOOL	619	29	4.7	96.6	625	31	5.0	100.0	2	0.3	52.7	74.3
Total for District 24		**3329**	**229**	**6.9**		**3423**	**203**	**5.9**		**-26**	**-0.9**		
425025	ADRIEN BLOCK SCHOOL	477	183	38.4	95.1	473	173	36.6	87.9	-10	-1.8	22.0	24.1
425168	PARSONS SCHOOL	305	37	12.1	94.6	291	55	18.9	87.3	18	6.8	47.9	47.3
425185	EDWARD BLEEKER SCHOOL	333	67	20.1	92.5	311	66	21.2	89.4	-1	1.1	34.7	49.9
425189	DANIEL CARTER BEARD SCHOOL	439	32	7.3	100.0	441	65	14.7	95.4	33	7.4	38.8	63.8
425194	WILLIAM H. CARR SCHOOL	343	170	49.6	85.3	326	162	49.7	86.4	-8	0.1	19.0	26.1
425237	RACHEL L. CARSON SCHOOL	399	70	17.5	100.0	407	85	20.9	90.6	15	3.3	33.0	60.8
425250	ROBERT F. KENNEDY COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	33	0	0.0	0.0	47	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	20.3	25.1
Total for District 25		**2329**	**559**	**24.0**		**2296**	**606**	**26.4**		**47**	**2.4**		
426067	LOUIS PASTEUR SCHOOL	314	75	23.9	100.0	286	72	25.2	100.0	-3	1.3	15.5	15.3
426074	NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE SCHOOL	346	0	0.0	0.0	354	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	29.1	17.5
426158	MARIE CURIE SCHOOL	293	33	11.3	100.0	315	35	11.1	97.1	2	-0.2	21.8	27.3
426172	IRWIN ALTMAN SCHOOL	316	123	38.9	95.1	341	120	35.2	92.5	-3	-3.7	26.9	20.7
426216	GEORGE RYAN SCHOOL	402	0	0.0	0.0	438	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	33.5	28.4
Total for District 26		**1671**	**231**	**13.8**		**1734**	**227**	**13.1**		**-4**	**-0.7**		
428008	RICHARD GROSSLEY SCHOOL	226	0	0.0	0.0	289	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.5	71.9

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
428072	COUNT & CATHERINE BASIE SCHOOL	181	0	0.0	0.0	171	52	30.4	3.8	52	30.4	98.6	73.3
428157	STEPHEN HALSEY SCHOOL	442	32	7.2	100.0	414	23	5.6	100.0	-9	-1.7	26.5	47.5
428190	RUSSELL SAGE SCHOOL	511	74	14.5	98.6	546	105	19.2	100.0	31	4.7	25.4	33.5
428217	ROBERT VAN WYCK SCHOOL	617	30	4.9	96.7	612	34	5.6	100.0	4	0.7	65.3	71.4
428680	GATEWAY TO HEALTH SERVICES SCHOOL	95	0	0.0	0.0	65	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	85.9	34.6
Total for District 28		**2072**	**136**	**6.6**		**2097**	**214**	**10.2**		**78**	**3.6**		
332162	WILLOUGHBY SCHOOL	239	0	0.0	0.0	316	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	92.4	79.8
332291	ROLAND HAYES SCHOOL	365	0	0.0	0.0	381	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.7	85.4
332296	HALSEY SCHOOL	350	0	0.0	0.0	272	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	99.4	92.5
332300	ROSE T. WEATHERLESS SCHOOL	48	0	0.0	0.0	34	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.7	82.7
332383	PHILIPPA SCHUYLER SCHOOL	333	55	16.5	90.9	365	54	14.8	94.4	-1	-1.7	96.9	54.9
Total for District 32		**1335**	**55**	**4.1**		**1368**	**54**	**3.9**		**-1**	**-0.2**		

Note 1:Three schools (317394, 332111, and 212193) experienced a change in BDS code across years and do not have 1996-97 8th grade register data. Therefore, they are missing from this report.

Note 2: Data for two schools (102879 and 316057) are not reported because their data from the BOE was incomplete at the time this report was released.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

Comparative Analysis of Select Districts' Performance

(Districts 2, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23-26, 28, 32)

Change in Percent of Students Taking Math Regents Test in 8th Grade

1996 and 1997

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
102070	O. HENRY SCHOOL	137	20	14.6	80.0	114	0	0.0	0.0	-20	-14.6	76.1	80.4
102104	SIMON BARUCH SCHOOL	347	150	43.2	82.0	295	105	35.6	81.9	-45	-7.6	38.4	54.7
102131	DR. SUN YAT SEN SCHOOL	477	43	9.0	100.0	424	79	18.6	87.3	36	9.6	12.8	90.4
102167	ROBERT WAGNER SCHOOL	401	159	39.7	99.4	470	227	48.3	91.2	68	8.6	30.2	17.9
102218	ROOSEVELT ISLAND SCHOOL	59	17	28.8	82.4	67	19	28.4	100.0	2	-0.5	72.1	56.7
102877	LAB UPPER SCHOOL	89	36	40.4	100.0	104	99	95.2	93.9	63	54.7	23.6	19.8
102878	SCHOOL OF THE FUTURE	77	0	0.0	0.0	63	1	1.6	100.0	1	1.6	60.5	66.7
102881	CLINTON SCHOOL	68	20	29.4	100.0	69	8	11.6	87.5	-12	-17.8	45.0	31.6
102882	EAST SIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL	82	13	15.9	100.0	108	25	23.1	88.0	12	7.3	28.7	12.5
102887	SCHOOL FOR THE PHYSICAL CITY	42	5	11.9	100.0	56	5	8.9	60.0	0	-3.0	53.5	24.8
102889	NYC MUSEUM SCHOOL	58	0	0.0	0.0	59	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	44.1	14.9
102891	SALK SCHOOL OF SCIENCES					50	11	22.0	100.0			36.4	39.4
102892	ADOLPH OCHS					65	0	0.0	0.0			85.0	91.7
102893	RIIS UPPER SCHOOL FOR LABOR					24	0	0.0	0.0			69.4	87.4
102894	P.S. DANCE SCHOOL					0	0	0.0	0.0			68.6	58.0
102895	ELIAS HOWE MIDDLE SCHOOL					0	0	0.0	0.0			85.5	97.3
Total for District 2		**1837**	**463**	**25.2**		**1968**	**579**	**29.4**		**116**	**4.2**		

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
207139	ALEXANDER BURGER SCHOOL	287	0	0.0	0.0	289	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.9	93.1
207149	ELIJAH D. CLARK SCHOOL	219	31	14.2	96.8	203	0	0.0	0.0	-31	-14.2	97.9	84.3
207151	HENRY LOU GEHRIG SCHOOL	150	0	0.0	0.0	149	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.3	86.1
207162	LOLA RODRIGUEZ DE TIO ACADEMY OF FUTURE TECH	271	0	0.0	0.0	230	20	8.7	15.0	20	8.7	99.0	91.1
207183	PAUL ROBESON SCHOOL	230	0	0.0	0.0	234	29	12.4	31.0	29	12.4	98.1	94.5
207184	RAFAEL CORDERO Y MOLINA SCHOOL	257	0	0.0	0.0	290	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.9	95.0
Total for District 7		**1414**	**31**	**2.2**		**1395**	**49**	**3.5**		**18**	**1.3**		
209022	JORDAN L. MOTT SCHOOL	408	0	0.0	0.0	312	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	94.9	88.3
209082	ALEXANDER MACOMBS SCHOOL	338	1	0.3	100.0	293	1	0.3	100.0	0	0.0	99.3	92.5
209117	JOSEPH H. WADE SCHOOL	384	41	10.7	87.8	351	71	20.2	64.8	30	9.6	98.0	89.6
209145	ARTURO TOSCANINI SCHOOL	347	13	3.7	92.3	367	30	8.2	56.7	17	4.4	97.0	90.8
209147	DIANA SANDS SCHOOL	491	35	7.1	65.7	490	23	4.7	47.8	-12	-2.4	97.8	84.0
209148	CHARLES R. DREW SCHOOL	248	25	10.1	28.0	218	15	6.9	13.3	-10	-3.2	99.1	95.5
209166	ROBERTO CLEMENTE SCHOOL	315	0	0.0	0.0	309	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	94.1	81.9
209229	DR. ROLAND N. PATTERSON SCHOOL	150	0	0.0	0.0	137	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.9	72.0
Total for District 9		**2681**	**115**	**4.3**		**2477**	**140**	**5.7**		**25**	**1.4**		
212098	FLAGS (HERMAN RIDDER CAMPUS) SCHOOL	204	0	0.0	0.0	191	20	10.5	100.0	20	10.5	95.1	80.0
212116	RAFAEL HERNANDEZ SCHOOL	456	31	6.8	80.6	337	33	9.8	36.4	2	3.0	95.6	85.6

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
212158	THEODORE ROOSEVELT GATHINGS MIDDLE SCHOOL	348	0	0.0	0.0	288	27	9.4	66.7	27	9.4	95.5	85.0
212200	LORRAINE HANSBERRY ACADEMY	349	0	0.0	0.0	280	30	10.7	40.0	30	10.7	96.6	85.9
Total for District 12		**1357**	**31**	**2.3**		**1096**	**110**	**10.0**		**79**	**7.8**		
316324	SARAH GARNETT SCHOOL	432	30	6.9	66.7	396	0	0.0	0.0	-30	-6.9	98.7	91.2
316835	W.E.B.DUBOIS SCHOOL OF MUSIC		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	97.2	84.6
316881	SCH. OF JOURNALISM, LITERARY STUD. & FINE ARTS		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	95.9	97.0
Total for District 16		**432**	**30**	**6.9**		**396**	**0**	**0.0**		**-30**	**-6.9**		
317002	M.S. 2	127	17	13.4	41.2	423	288	68.1	17.7	271	54.7	94.5	100.0
317022	P.S. 22		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.4	100.0
317061	ATWELL GLADSTONE SCHOOL	532	58	10.9	53.4	461	86	18.7	31.4	28	7.8	94.0	74.5
317246	WALT WHITMAN SCHOOL	420	55	13.1	87.3	466	59	12.7	37.3	4	-0.4	96.8	65.5
317320	JACKIE ROBINSON SCHOOL	519	0	0.0	0.0	477	115	24.1	7.0	115	24.1	93.8	85.8
317390	MAGGIE WALKER SCHOOL	428	106	24.8	88.7	506	152	30.0	49.3	46	5.3	96.0	71.1
317391	MAHALIA JACKSON SCHOOL	402	32	8.0	56.3	392	249	63.5	0.0	217	55.6	98.9	75.3
Total for District 17		**2428**	**268**	**11.0**		**2725**	**949**	**34.8**		**681**	**23.8**		
319166	GEORGE GERSHWIN SCHOOL	403	26	6.5	100.0	394	29	7.4	100.0	3	0.9	95.9	75.3
319171	ABRAHAM LINCOLN SCHOOL	288	15	5.2	93.3	254	19	7.5	73.7	4	2.3	88.9	96.4
319218	JAMES PETER SINNOTT MAGNET SCHOOL	339	21	6.2	71.4	400	27	6.8	63.0	6	0.6	97.1	84.5
319292	MARGARET S. DOUGLAS SCHOOL	402	58	14.4	10.3	344	0	0.0	0.0	-58	-14.4	98.1	92.8

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

Source: Annual School Reports, NYC Public Schools

Prepared by New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy, June 1998

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
319302	RAFAEL CORDERO Y MOLINA SCHOOL	512	0	0.0	0.0	441	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	90.9	87.4
319364	GATEWAY SCHOOL	232	20	8.6	100.0	226	19	8.4	100.0	-1	-0.2	76.3	73.0
319409	EAST NY FAMILY ACADEMY	44	4	9.1	100.0	41	5	12.2	100.0	1	3.1	96.8	83.3
Total for District 19		**2220**	**144**	**6.5**		**2100**	**99**	**4.7**		**-45**	**-1.8**		
321043	JAMES REYNOLDS SCHOOL	357	55	15.4	90.9	427	96	22.5	61.5	41	7.1	36.6	79.0
321096	SETH LOW SCHOOL	388	30	7.7	100.0	391	53	13.6	100.0	23	5.8	28.2	72.4
321098	BAY ACADEMY FOR ARTS AND SCIENCES		0	0.0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	18.7	
321228	DAVID A. BOODY SCHOOL	386	69	17.9	100.0	462	103	22.3	89.3	34	4.4	30.0	70.5
321239	MARK TWAIN SCHOOL	376	124	33.0	100.0	346	155	44.8	100.0	31	11.8	13.0	30.1
321280	BROOKLYN STUDIO SECONDARY SCHOOL		0	0.0	0.0	74	29	39.2	96.6	29	39.2	21.0	81.1
321281	JOSEPH CAVALLARO SCHOOL	395	134	33.9	98.5	356	89	25.0	96.6	-45	-8.9	32.3	73.2
321303	GEORGE C. TILYOU SCHOOL	260	72	27.7	84.7	217	58	26.7	87.9	-14	-1.0	34.3	72.3
Total for District 21		**2162**	**484**	**22.4**		**2273**	**683**	**25.6**		**99**	**3.3**		
323055	OCEANHILL BROWNSVILLE SCHOOL	183	32	17.5	59.4	204	58	28.4	15.5	26	10.9	96.8	77.0
323263	ESTHER C. HUNTER SCHOOL	244	0	0.0	0.0	194	18	9.3	0.0	18	9.3	97.7	100.0
323271	JOHN M. COLEMAN SCHOOL	231	23	10.0	69.6	287	28	9.8	82.1	5	-0.2	97.6	76.7
323275	THELMA J. HAMILTON SCHOOL	239	1	0.4	100.0	308	0	0.0	0.0	-1	-0.4	97.5	100.0
Total for District 23		**897**	**56**	**6.2**		**993**	**104**	**10.5**		**48**	**4.2**		
424061	LEONARDO DA VINCI SCHOOL	733	29	4.0	62.1	718	27	3.8	92.6	-2	-0.2	83.9	73.4

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

Source: Annual School Reports, NYC Public Schools

Prepared by New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy, June 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
424073	WILLIAM COWPER INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	882	105	11.9	99.0	876	74	8.4	98.6	-31	-3.5	56.5	71.2
424077	I.S. 77	303	43	14.2	95.3	417	27	6.5	63.0	-16	-7.7	67.3	80.4
424093	RIDGEWOOD INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL	479	87	18.2	81.6	493	65	13.2	93.8	-22	-5.0	53.3	73.5
424119	GLENDALE SCHOOL	313	34	10.9	100.0	294	62	21.1	87.1	28	10.2	22.3	37.0
424125	WOODSIDE SCHOOL	619	134	21.6	97.0	625	138	22.1	92.0	4	0.4	52.7	74.3
Total for District 24		**3329**	**432**	**13.0**		**3423**	**393**	**11.5**		**-39**	**-1.5**		
425025	ADRIEN BLOCK SCHOOL	477	179	37.5	96.6	473	199	42.1	89.4	20	4.5	22.0	24.1
425168	PARSONS SCHOOL	305	65	21.3	100.0	291	56	19.2	98.2	-9	-2.1	47.9	47.3
425185	EDWARD BLEEKER SCHOOL	333	105	31.5	93.3	311	102	32.8	96.1	-3	1.3	34.7	49.9
425189	DANIEL CARTER BEARD SCHOOL	439	99	22.6	93.9	441	82	18.6	97.6	-17	-4.0	38.8	63.8
425194	WILLIAM H. CARR SCHOOL	343	170	49.6	93.5	326	164	50.3	86.0	-6	0.7	19.0	26.1
425237	RACHEL L. CARSON SCHOOL	399	219	54.9	93.6	407	211	51.8	79.6	-8	-3.0	33.0	60.8
425250	ROBERT F. KENNEDY COMMUNITY MIDDLE SCHOOL	33	5	15.2	60.0	47	24	51.1	91.7	19	35.9	20.3	25.1
Total for District 25		**2329**	**842**	**36.2**		**2296**	**838**	**36.5**		**-4**	**0.3**		
426067	LOUIS PASTEUR SCHOOL	314	180	57.3	99.4	286	167	58.4	90.4	-13	1.1	15.5	15.3
426074	NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE SCHOOL	346	128	37.0	100.0	354	151	42.7	99.3	23	5.7	29.1	17.5
426158	MARIE CURIE SCHOOL	293	144	49.1	92.4	315	119	37.8	97.5	-25	-11.4	21.8	27.3
426172	IRWIN ALTMAN SCHOOL	316	121	38.3	97.5	341	120	35.2	97.5	-1	-3.1	26.9	20.7
426216	GEORGE RYAN SCHOOL	402	203	50.5	96.1	438	234	53.4	91.5	31	2.9	33.5	28.4

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

Source: Annual School Reports, NYC Public Schools

Prepared by New York University's Institute for Education and Social Policy, June 1998

BDS	School Name	1995-96 8th Graders (GES)	1995-96 Number Tested	1995-96 Percent Tested	1995-96 Percent Passing	1996-97 8th Graders (GES)	1996-97 Number Tested	1996-97 Percent Tested	1996-97 Percent Passing	Change in Number Tested	Difference in Percent Tested	1996-97 School Percents Black and Hispanic	1996-97 School Percents Free Lunch
Total for District 26		**1671**	**776**	**46.4**		**1734**	**791**	**45.6**		**15**	**-0.8**		
428008	RICHARD GROSSLEY SCHOOL	226	0	0.0	0.0	289	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	96.5	71.9
428072	COUNT & CATHERINE BASIE SCHOOL	181	33	18.2	6.1	171	53	31.0	30.2	20	12.8	98.6	73.3
428157	STEPHEN HALSEY SCHOOL	442	88	19.9	100.0	414	53	12.8	100.0	-35	-7.1	26.5	47.5
428190	RUSSELL SAGE SCHOOL	511	177	34.6	97.7	546	191	35.0	91.6	14	0.3	25.4	33.5
428217	ROBERT VAN WYCK SCHOOL	617	98	15.9	87.8	612	103	16.8	63.1	5	0.9	65.3	71.4
428680	GATEWAY TO HEALTH SERVICES SCHOOL	95	64	67.4	96.9	65	60	92.3	86.7	-4	24.9	85.9	34.6
Total for District 28		**2072**	**460**	**22.2**		**2097**	**460**	**21.9**		**0**	**-0.3**		
332162	WILLOUGHBY SCHOOL	239	24	10.0	75.0	316	29	9.2	89.7	5	-0.9	92.4	79.8
332291	ROLAND HAYES SCHOOL	365	27	7.4	63.0	381	28	7.3	92.9	1	0.0	97.7	85.4
332296	HALSEY SCHOOL	350	33	9.4	84.8	272	31	11.4	93.5	-2	2.0	99.4	92.5
332300	ROSE T. WEATHERLESS SCHOOL	48	0	0.0	0.0	34	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	98.7	82.7
332383	PHILIPPA SCHUYLER SCHOOL	333	121	36.3	97.5	365	79	21.6	93.7	-42	-14.7	96.9	54.9
Total for District 32		**1335**	**205**	**15.4**		**1368**	**167**	**12.2**		**-38**	**-3.1**		

Note 1: Three schools (317394, 332111, and 212193) experienced a change in BDS code across years and do not have 1996-97 8th grade register data. Therefore, they are missing from this report.

Note 2: Data for two schools (102879 and 316057) are not reported because their data from the BOE was incomplete at the time this report was released.

Where a school's data is blank for the entire year, that middle school did not yet serve 8th graders. Middle schools that did not have an 8th grade at all were removed from this report.

The New York ACORN Schools Office & Network of Community Schools

The New York Association of Community Organization for Reform Now (ACORN) is a grassroots community based organization with a membership of over 20,000 low to moderate income families. ACORN members organize to influence a wide range of issues including education, housing, crime, bank investment, employment, and health care. ACORN is governed by elected neighborhood leaders who serve on the New York ACORN Executive Board and are represented on ACORN's National Executive Board.

The ACORN Schools Office was established in 1988 in response to ACORN members' intense interest in improving local schools. The Schools Office is governed by the City-Wide Education Committee, made of members from each ACORN neighborhood and school. Members and staff organize campaigns around education issues and develop small, autonomous public schools in ACORN neighborhoods.

The New York ACORN Network of Community Schools

ACORN schools are characterized by a commitment to high educational standards, innovative pedagogical practice oriented around themes of social change, a genuinely democratic school governance system, and strong community and parental involvement.

ACORN members start schools by first developing a neighborhood education committee made up of existing members and parents. After formulating the vision for the particular school and securing a commitment from the superintendent of the school district to open a school, the committee works with the superintendent to select a committed project director, with whom they implement plans for the school. Once the school is operational, ACORN members continue to play a role through sitting on the School Council, participating in curriculum development and the hiring of teaching staff, attending school meetings, etc.

The N.Y. ACORN Network of Community Schools includes **P.S. 245 Elementary** (Flatbush) (1993); **ACORN Community High School: Crown Heights** (1996); and **Bread and Roses Integrated Arts High School** (Washington Heights/West Harlem) (1997). **ACORN Community High School: Bushwick** is slated to open in September 1999. ACORN is also working to open an elementary school in East New York and is working with parents at a 5th and 6th grade Academy in Far Rockaway.

Educational Issue Organizing

The Schools Office and City-wide Education Committee have also produced three reports: ***Secret Apartheid: A Report on the Racial Discrimination of Black and Latino Parents and Children in the New York City Schools*** demonstrated how parents were treated differently depending on their race when trying to obtain information about gifted kindergarten programs. This report resulted in a U.S. Dept. of Education Office of Civil Rights resolution requiring the NYC Board of Ed. to take action to prevent further discrimination.

Secret Apartheid II: Race, Regents and Resources, demonstrates that the course work necessary to do well on entrance examinations to the specialized math and science high schools is not equally available to students across the city. ACORN members are lobbying the Board of Ed.to remedy the coursework situation, as well as pushing for the creation of a schools/education information clearinghouse.

Secret Apartheid III: Follow Up To Failure shows that the Board of Ed. has failed to remedy the discrimination highlighted in the first report. The report also details how certain schools receive federal magnet money, which is intended to reduce segregation between schools, to set up gifted programs primarily for white students.

New York ACORN 88 Third Ave, 3rd Floor, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11217
(718) 246-7900 (219/231) / (718) 246-7929 fax

BEST COPY AVAILABLE